

Jason K. Singleton, State Bar #166170
Richard E. Grabowski, State Bar # 236207
SINGLETON LAW GROUP
611 "L" Street, Suite A
Eureka, CA 95501
lawgroup@sbcglobal.net

(707) 441-1177
FAX 441-1533

Attorney for Plaintiff, MARSHALL LOSKOT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARSHALL LOSKOT,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUPER STAR, LLC, a California Limited
Liability Company, dba DAYS' INN, SHUN
LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. C 06 7199 CW

Civil Rights

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
AND DAMAGES: DENIAL OF CIVIL
RIGHTS OF A DISABLED PERSON IN
VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH
DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990; VIOLATION
OF CALIFORNIA'S CIVIL RIGHTS
STATUTES

JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** complains of defendants **SUPER STAR, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, dba DAYS' INN, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive**, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. The Court has jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 **USC** § 1331 for violations of the **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**, (42 **USC** § 12101, *et seq.*) Pursuant to pendant jurisdiction, attendant and related causes of action, arising from the same facts, are also brought under California law, including, but not limited to, violations of **California Health & Safety Code** § 19955, *et seq.*, including **California Code of Regulations**, Title 24, § 19959, **California Civil Code** §§ 51, 51.5, 52(a), 52.1, 54, 54.1, 54.3 and 55.

2. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 **USC** § 1391(b) and is founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is located in this district, at San Bruno, San Mateo County, California, and that Plaintiff's causes of action arose in this district.

INTRODUCTION

3. **DAYS' INN** is located at 1550 El Camino Real, San Bruno, San Mateo County, California. Said motel is owned and operated by defendants **SUPER STAR, LLC, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive.**

Defendants **SUPER STAR, LLC, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive,** operate an establishment for services to the public and at which Defendants failed to provide barrier free access to said establishment in conformity with both Federal and California legal requirements. Further, Defendants failed to provide compliance as follows:

1. Access around the room and to the heater/air conditioning unit is inaccessible and blocked by a chair and the position of the bed in violation of California Title 24 §1133B.6.1, §1111B.4.3, §1004.4.3.2.2, ADAAG 4.3.3, 4.2.3*.
2. The lamps require a grasp and twist motion to turn on and off in violation of California Title 24 §1117B.6, ADAAG 4.27.4.
3. There is no peephole at wheelchair level in the entrance door in violation of California Title 24 §1114B.2.4.
4. There is no bench or seat in the roll-in shower in violation of California Title 24 §1115B.6.2.4.5.1, ADAAG 4.21.3.
5. There is not enough clear space next to the toilet and the toilet is too far from the wall to the center of the toilet in violation of California Title 24 § 1109A, §1115B.7.2, California Plumbing Code §1502, ADAAG 4.16.2., 4.17.3.
6. The ramp to the sidewalk encroaches into the parking aisle making use of a wheelchair lift almost impossible in violation of California Title 24 §1129B.4.3.
7. The accessible check-in counter is blocked with fake flowers and other things in violation of California Title 24 § 1117B.7.2.
8. There is not a cross section of accessible rooms available, one size only, in violation of California Title 24 § 1111B.4.1.
9. No alternate or reasonable accommodations are offered to my caregiver because of the lack of cross section availability and he was required to sleep on the floor to be near me.
10. Continental Breakfast was unavailable without assistance because plates,

bowls, coffee cups, and silverware are all out of wheelchair accessible reach in violation of California Title 24 §1104B.5.5, §1122B.4, §1125B.4, §1117B.6.3, §1118B.5, ADAAG 5.2, 4.34.3(1)(2).

11. Breakfast tables are too small with no room to roll a wheelchair under in violation of California Title 24 §1122B.

The above barriers interfered with Plaintiff's access of the facilities and continue to deter Plaintiff from visiting said facilities, and as a legal result, Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** suffers violations of his civil rights to full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, facilities and privileges, and has and will suffer embarrassment and humiliation.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

4. Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** is, and at all times relevant to this Complaint is, a "physically handicapped person," "physically disabled person," and a "person with a disability," as these terms are used under California law and under federal laws including, but not limited to, Title III of the ***Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990***. (The terms "physically handicapped person," "physically disabled person," and a "person with a disability" will be used interchangeably throughout this Complaint.) Plaintiff is a "person with a disability," as defined by all applicable California and United State's laws. Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** is severely limited in the use of his legs.

5. Defendants **SUPER STAR, LLC, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive**, at all times relevant herein were and are the owners and operators; lessors and/or lessees, franchisers and/or franchisees, of public facilities known as the "**DAYS' INN**," located at San Bruno, San Mateo County, California, subject to the requirements of California state law requiring full and equal access to public facilities pursuant to ***California Health & Safety Code*** § 19955, *et seq.*, ***California Civil Code*** §§ 51, 51.5, 52(a), 52.1, 54, 54.1, 54.3 and 55, and subject to Title III of the ***Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990***, and to all other legal requirements referred to in this Complaint. Plaintiff does not know the relative responsibilities of defendants in the operation of the facilities herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such defendants.

6. Defendants **SUPER STAR, LLC, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive** (hereinafter alternatively referred to collectively as "defendants"), at all times

1 relevant herein were and are owners, possessors, builders and keepers of the "**DAYS' INN**" in
2 San Bruno, San Mateo County, California.

3 7. Defendants **SUPER STAR, LLC, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY,**
4 **inclusive** are the owners and operators of the subject "**DAYS' INN**" at all times relevant to this
5 Complaint. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the defendants herein is the agent,
6 employee or representative of each of the other defendants, and performed all acts and
7 omissions stated herein within the scope of such agency or employment or representative
8 capacity and is responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions of the other defendants
9 in legally causing the damages complained of herein, and have approved or ratified each of
10 the acts or omissions of each other defendant, as herein described.

11 8. Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** does not know the true names and capacities of
12 defendants **SUPER STAR, LLC, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive,**
13 their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, nor their
14 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a
15 joint venture and common enterprise by all such defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes
16 that each of the defendants herein, including DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive, is the agent,
17 ostensible agent, master, servant, employer, employee, representative, franchiser, franchisee,
18 joint venturer, partner, and associate, or such similar capacity, of each of the other defendants,
19 and was at all times acting and performing, or failing to act or perform, with the authorization,
20 consent, permission or ratification of each of the other defendants, and is responsible in some
21 manner for the acts and omissions of the other defendants in legally causing the violations and
22 damages complained of herein, and have approved or ratified each of the acts or omissions of
23 each other defendant, as herein described. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint
24 when the true names, capacities, connections and responsibilities of defendants **SUPER**
25 **STAR, LLC, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive,** are ascertained.

26 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes that all named defendants, including DOES
27 ONE to FIFTY, inclusive, conspired to commit the acts described herein, or alternatively, aided
28 and abetted one another in the performance of the wrongful acts hereinafter alleged.

10. Defendants **SUPER STAR, LLC, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive**, are the owners and operators of the "**DAYS' INN**," located at San Bruno, San Mateo County, California. This motel, including, but not limited to, parking spaces and access aisles and access routes, are each a part of a "public accommodation or facility" subject to the requirements of **California Health & Safety Code** § 19955, *et seq.*, and of **California Civil Code** §§ 51, 52(a), 54, 54.1, *et seq.* On information and belief, this "**DAYS' INN**" motel was constructed after 1990, which has subjected the "**DAYS' INN**" motel to handicapped access requirements per **California Health & Safety Code** § 19959, and applicable portions of **California Code of Regulations**, Title 24, (the State Building Code).

11. On or about May 30, 2006, Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT**, visited the "**DAYS' INN**" in San Bruno, San Mateo County, California for the purpose of obtaining a motel room. Defendants **SUPER STAR, LLC, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive**, interfered with Plaintiff's access to the "**DAYS' INN**" as set forth in Paragraph 3 above.

Said acts and omissions denied Plaintiff legal handicapped access to the "**DAYS' INN**" according to federal and state law.

12. Plaintiff encountered and/or is informed and believes that the following architectural barriers, which violate the requirements of the **California Code of Regulations** Title 24 and **ADAAG**, existed and continue to exist thereby denying Plaintiff and those similarly situated full and equal access to the subject public facility as set forth in Paragraph 3 above.

13. Defendants, and each of them, discriminated against Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** on the basis of his physical disability, and interfered with his access to the "**DAYS' INN**" establishment, in violation of both California law including, but not limited to, **California Civil Code** §§ 51, 51.5, 54, 54.1, and a violation of Title III, §302, the "Prohibition of Discrimination" provision and §503, the "Prohibition Against Retaliation or Coercion" provision of the **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**.

14. As a result of the actions and failure to act of defendants, and each of them, and as a result of the failure to provide appropriate handicapped parking, proper handicapped signage, proper handicapped accessible entryways, and handicapped accommodations for a

1 motel, Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** suffered and will suffer a loss of his civil rights to full and
 2 equal access to public facilities, and further suffered and will suffer emotional distress, mental
 3 distress, mental suffering, mental anguish, which includes shame, humiliation, embarrassment,
 4 anger, chagrin, disappointment and worry, expectedly and naturally associated with a person
 5 with a physical disability being denied access to a public accommodation, all to his damages
 6 as prayed hereinafter in an amount within the jurisdiction of this court.

7 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:**

8 VIOLATION OF **THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990**
 (42 **USC** §12101 *et seq.*)

9 15. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein,
 10 the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 14 of this Complaint and incorporates them
 11 herein as if separately replied.

12 16. Pursuant to law, in 1990 the United States Congress made findings per 42 **USC**
 13 § 12101 regarding persons with physical disabilities, finding that laws were needed to more
 14 fully protect 43 million Americans with one or more physical or mental disabilities; [that]
 15 historically society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities; [that] such
 16 forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and
 17 pervasive social problem; [that] the nation's proper goals regarding individuals with disabilities
 18 are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-
 19 sufficiency for such individuals; [and that] the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary
 20 discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an
 21 equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous.

22 17. Congress stated as its purpose in passing the **Americans with Disabilities Act**
 23 **of 1990** (42 **USC** § 12102):

24 It is the purpose of this act (1) to provide a clear and comprehensive
 25 national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with
 26 disabilities; (2) to provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards
 27 addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; (3) to ensure that
 28 the Federal government plays a central role in enforcing the standards
 established in this act on behalf of individuals with disabilities; and (4) to invoke
 the sweep of Congressional authority, including the power to enforce the 14th
 Amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of

discrimination faced day to day by people with disabilities.

18. As part of the ***Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990***, Public Law 101-336 (hereinafter the “ADA”), Congress passed “Title III - Public Accommodations and Services Operated by Private Entities” (42 **USC** § 12181 *et seq.*). Among the public accommodations identified for purposes of this title were “an inn, hotel, motel, or other place of lodging, . . .”

19. Pursuant to 42 **USC** § 12182,

“No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation.”

20. Among the general prohibitions against discrimination were included in 42 **USC** §12182(b)(1)(A)(i):

Denial of participation. It shall be discriminatory to subject an individual or class of individuals on the basis of a disability or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements, to a denial of the opportunity of the individual or class to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of an entity.

21. Among the general prohibitions against discrimination were included in 42 **USC** §12182(b)(1)(E):

Association -- It shall be discriminatory to exclude or otherwise deny equal goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, accommodations, or other opportunities to an individual or entity because of the known disability of an individual with whom the individual or entity is known to have a relationship or association.

The acts of defendants set forth herein were a violation of Plaintiff’s rights under the ADA, Public Law 101-336, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 28 **CFR** Part 36 *et seq.*

22. Among the general prohibitions against discrimination were included in 42 **USC** § 12182(b)(2)(A)(i) and 42 **USC** § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii):

Discrimination. For purposes of subsection (a), discrimination includes -

(i) the imposition or application of eligibility criteria that screen out or tend to screen out an individual with a disability or any class of individuals with disabilities from fully and equally enjoying any goods, services, facilities,

1 privileges, advantages, or accommodations, unless such criteria can be shown to
2 be necessary for the provision of the goods, services, facilities, privileges,
advantages, or accommodations being offered;

3 (ii) a failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or
4 procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods,
5 services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with
6 disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications
would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities,
privileges, advantages, or accommodations.

7 23. Plaintiff alleges that constructing the eligibility requirements, policies, practices
8 and procedure for entry to the "**DAYS' INN**" facility by persons with disabilities and their
9 companions as established by the defendants can be simply modified to eliminate disparate
10 and discriminatory treatment of persons with disabilities by properly constructing barrier free
11 handicapped access for safe and full and equal enjoyment of the "**DAYS' INN**" as that enjoyed
12 by other people.

13 24. The specific prohibition against retaliation and coercion is included in the
14 ***Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990*** § 503(b) and the *Remedies and Procedures* in §
15 503(c):

16 (b) Interference, Coercion, or Intimidation. - It shall be unlawful to coerce,
17 intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment
18 of, or on account of his or her having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his
or her having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or
enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by this Act.

19 (c) Remedies and Procedure. - The remedies and procedures available
20 under sections 107, 203, and 308 of this Act shall be available to aggrieved
21 persons for violations of subsections (a) and (b), with respect to Title I, Title II
and Title III, respectively.

22 25. Among the specific prohibitions against discrimination were included, in 42 **USC**
23 § 12182(b)(2)(a)(iv), "A failure to remove architectural barriers, and communications barriers
24 that are structural in nature, in existing facilities...where such removal is readily achievable;"
25 and (v) "where and entity can demonstrate that the removal of a barrier under clause (iv) is not
26 readily achievable, a failure to make such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or
27 accommodations available through alternative methods if such methods are readily
28 achievable." The acts of Defendants set forth herein were a violations of Plaintiff's rights under

1 the “ADA,” Public Law 101-336, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 28 **CFR** Part 36,
 2 *et seq.*

3 26. The removal of the barriers complained of by Plaintiff as hereinabove alleged
 4 were at all times after 1990 “readily achievable.” On information and belief, if the removal of all
 5 the barriers complained of here together were not “readily achievable,” the removal of each
 6 individual barrier complained of herein was “readily achievable.”

7 27. Per 42 **USC** § 12181(9), “The term ‘readily achievable’ means easily
 8 accomplishable and able to be carried out without much difficulty or expense.” The statute and
 9 attendant regulations define relative “expense” in relation to the total financial resources of the
 10 entities involved, including any “parent” companies. Plaintiff alleges that properly repairing
 11 each of the items that Plaintiff complains of herein is readily achievable, including, but not
 12 limited to, correcting and repairing the items set forth in Paragraph 3 above.

13 The changes needed to remove barriers to access for the disabled were and are
 14 “readily achievable” by the defendants under standards set forth under 42 **USC** § 12181 of the
 15 ***Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990***. (Further, if it was not “readily achievable” for
 16 defendants to remove all such barriers, defendants have failed to make the required services
 17 available through alternative methods, although such methods are achievable as required by
 18 42 **USC** §12181(b)(2)(a)(iv), (v).)

19 28. Pursuant to the ***Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990***, §308 (42 **USC** §
 20 12188 *et seq.*), Plaintiff is entitled to the remedies and procedures set forth in the ***Civil Rights***
 21 ***Act of 1964*** §204(a), (42 **USC** § 2000a-3(a)), as Plaintiff is being subjected to discrimination
 22 on the basis of disability in violation of this title and/or Plaintiff has reasonable grounds for
 23 believing that he is about to be subjected to discrimination in violation of ***Americans With***
 24 ***Disabilities Act of 1990*** §302. Plaintiff cannot return to or make use of the public facilities
 25 complained of herein for the purpose of entry and provision of goods and service so long as
 26 defendants continue to apply eligibility criteria, policies, practices and procedures to screen out
 27 and refuse to allow entry and service to persons with disabilities such as Plaintiff’s.

28 29. Defendants’, and each of their acts and omissions of failing to provide barrier free

handicapped access for Plaintiff, were tantamount to interference, coercion or intimidation pursuant to **Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990** §503(b) (now 42 **USC** § 12203):

It shall be unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his or her having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by this Act.

30. Per **Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990** § 308(a)(1) (now 42 **USC** § 12188), "Nothing in this section shall require a person with a disability to engage in a futile gesture if such person has actual notice that a person or organization covered by this title does not intend to comply with its provisions." Pursuant to this last section, Plaintiff, on information and belief, alleges that defendants have continued to violate the law and deny the rights of Plaintiff and other disabled persons to access this public accommodation for the purpose of obtaining lodging. Therefore, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief pursuant to §308(a)(2),

"...Where appropriate, injunctive relief shall also include requiring the provision of an auxiliary aid or service, modifications of a policy, or provision of alternative methods, to the extent required by this title."

31. Plaintiff seeks relief pursuant to remedies set forth in § 204(a) of the **Civil Rights Act of 1964** (42 **USC** § 2000a-3(a), and pursuant to federal regulations adopted to implement the **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**, including, but not limited to, an order granting injunctive relief and attorneys' fees. Such attorneys' fees, "including litigation expenses and costs," are further specifically provided for by §505 of Title III.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for damages as hereinafter stated.

II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

BREACH OF STATUTORY PROTECTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES (**California Health & Safety Code** § 19955, *et seq.*)

32. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Complaint and incorporate them herein as if separately repled.

33. **California Health & Safety Code** § 19955 provides in pertinent part:

The purpose of this part is to insure that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Sec. 4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the

Government Code. For the purposes of this part “public accommodation or facilities” means a building, structure, facility, complex, or improved area which is used by the general public and shall include auditoriums, hospitals, theaters, restaurants, hotels, motels, stadiums, and convention centers. When sanitary facilities are made available for the public, clients or employees in such accommodations or facilities, they shall be made available for the handicapped.

34. **California Health & Safety Code** § 19956, which appears in the same chapter as §19955, provides in pertinent part, “accommodations constructed in this state shall conform to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Sec. 4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the *Government Code*...” **California Health & Safety Code** § 19956 was operative July 1, 1970, and is applicable to all public accommodations constructed or altered after that date. On information and belief, portions of “**DAYS’ INN**” and/or of its buildings, were constructed and/or altered after July 1, 1970, and substantial portions of said building had alterations, structural repairs, and/or additions made to such public accommodations after July 1, 1970, thereby requiring said public accommodations and/or buildings to be subject to the requirements of Part 5.5, **California Health & Safety Code** § 19955, *et seq.*, upon such alteration, structural repairs or additions per **California Health & Safety Code** § 19959.

35. Pursuant to the authority delegated by **California Government Code** § 4450, *et seq.*, the State Architect promulgated regulations for the enforcement of these provisions. Effective January 1, 1982, Title 24 of the **California Administrative Code** adopted the California State Architect's Regulations and these regulations must be complied with as to any alterations and/or modifications of the “**DAYS’ INN**” occurring after that date. Construction changes occurring prior to this date but after July 1, 1970 triggered access requirements pursuant to the “ASA” requirements, the **American Standards Association Specifications**, A117.1-1961. On information and belief, at the time of the construction and modification of said building, all buildings and facilities covered were required to conform to each of the standards and specifications described in the **American Standards Association Specifications** and/or those contained in Title 24 of the **California Administrative Code**, (now known as Title 24, **California Code of Regulations**.)

36. Public facilities, such as “**DAYS’ INN**” are public accommodations or facilities within the meaning of **California Health & Safety Code** § 19955, *et seq.*

1 37. It is difficult or impossible for persons with physical disabilities who use
2 wheelchairs, canes, walkers and service animals to travel about in public to use a motel with
3 the defects set forth in Paragraph 3 above as required by Title 24 of the **California Code of**
4 **Regulations** and the **Americans with Disabilities Act Access Guidelines (ADAAG)**. Thus,
5 when public accommodations fail to provide handicap accessible public facilities, persons with
6 physical disabilities are unable to enter and use said facilities, and are denied full and equal
7 access to and use of that facility that is enjoyed by other members of the general public.

8 38. Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** and other similarly situated persons with physical
9 disabilities whose physical conditions require the use of wheelchairs, canes, walkers and
10 service animals are unable to use public facilities on a “full and equal” basis unless each such
11 facility is in compliance with the provisions of the **California Health & Safety Code** § 19955,
12 *et seq.* Plaintiff is a member of that portion of the public whose rights are protected by the
13 provisions of **California Health & Safety Code** § 19955, *et seq.*

14 39. The **California Health & Safety Code** was enacted “[t]o ensure that public
15 accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds adhere to the
16 provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with §4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the *Government*
17 *Code.*” Such public accommodations are defined to include motels.

18 40. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that as of the date of filing this
19 Complaint, Defendants have not made accessible the facilities at the subject motel as set forth
20 in Paragraph 3 above.

21 41. Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** is informed and believes, and therefore alleges,
22 that Defendants **SUPER STAR, LLC, SHUN LIN CHOW, and DOES ONE to FIFTY,**
23 **inclusive**, and each of them, caused the subject buildings constituting “**DAYS’ INN**” to be
24 constructed, altered and maintained in such a manner that persons with physical disabilities
25 were denied full and equal access to, within and throughout said buildings and were denied full
26 and equal use of said public facilities, and despite knowledge and actual and constructive
27 notice to such Defendants that the configuration of the motel and/or buildings was in violation
28 of the civil rights of persons with physical disabilities, such as Plaintiff. Such construction,

1 modification, ownership, operation, maintenance and practices of such public facilities are in
2 violation of law as stated in Part 5.5, **California Health & Safety Code** § 19955, *et seq.*, and
3 elsewhere in the laws of California.

4 42. On information and belief, the subject building constituting the public facilities of
5 “**DAYS’ INN**” denied full and equal access to Plaintiff and other persons with physical
6 disabilities in other respects due to non-compliance with requirement of Title 24 of the
7 **California Code of Regulations** and **California Health & Safety Code** § 19955, *et seq.*

8 43. The basis of Plaintiff’s aforementioned information and belief is the various
9 means upon which Defendants must have acquired such knowledge, including, but not limited
10 to, this lawsuit, other access lawsuits, communications with operators of other motels and
11 other property owners regarding denial access, communications with Plaintiff and other
12 persons with disabilities, communications with other patrons who regularly visit there,
13 communications with owners of other businesses, notices and advisories they obtained from
14 governmental agencies through the mails, at seminars, posted bulletins, television, radio,
15 public service announcements, or upon modification, improvement, alteration or substantial
16 repair of the subject premises and other properties owned by these Defendants, newspaper
17 articles and trade publications regarding the **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990** and
18 other access law, and other similar information. The scope and means of the knowledge of
19 each defendant is within each defendant’s exclusive control and cannot be ascertained except
20 through discovery.

21 44. As a result of Defendants’ acts and omissions in this regard, Plaintiff has been
22 required to incur legal expenses and hire attorneys in order to enforce his civil rights and
23 enforce provisions of the law protecting access for persons with physical disabilities and
24 prohibiting discrimination against persons with physical disabilities, and to take such action
25 both in his own interests and in order to enforce an important right affecting the public interest.
26 Plaintiff, therefore, seeks damages in this lawsuit for recovery of all reasonable attorneys’ fees
27 incurred, pursuant to the provisions of the **California Code of Civil Procedure** § 1021.5.
28 Plaintiff additionally seeks attorneys’ fees pursuant to **California Health & Safety Code** §

1 19953 and **California Civil Code** §§ 54.3 and 55.

2 45. Defendants, and each of them, at times prior to and including May 30, 2006, and
3 continuing to the present time, knew that persons with physical disabilities were denied their
4 rights of equal access to all portions of this public facility. Despite such knowledge,
5 Defendants failed and refused to take steps to comply with the applicable access statutes; and
6 despite knowledge of the resulting problems and denial of civil rights thereby suffered by
7 Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** and other similarly situated persons with disabilities, including
8 the specific notices referred to in paragraph 43 of this Complaint. Defendants have failed and
9 refused to take action to grant full and equal access to persons with physical disabilities in the
10 respects complained of hereinabove. Defendants and each of them have carried out a course
11 of conduct of refusing to respond to, or correct complaints about, denial of handicap access.
12 Such actions and continuing course of conduct by Defendants, evidence despicable conduct in
13 conscious disregard for the rights or safety of Plaintiff and of other similarly situated persons,
14 justifying an award of treble damages pursuant to **California Civil Code** § 54.3.

15 46. Defendants' actions have also been oppressive to persons with physical
16 disabilities and of other members of the public, and have evidenced actual or implied malicious
17 intent toward those members of the public, such as Plaintiff and other persons with physical
18 disabilities who have been denied the proper access they are entitled to by law. Further,
19 Defendants' refusals on a day-to-day basis to correct these problems evidence despicable
20 conduct in conscious disregard for the rights of Plaintiff and other members of the public with
21 physical disabilities.

22 47. Plaintiff prays for an award of treble damages against Defendants, and each of
23 them, pursuant to **California Civil Code** § 54.3 in an amount sufficient to make a more
24 profound example of Defendants and discourage owners, operators, franchisers and
25 franchisees of other public facilities from willful disregard of the rights of persons with physical
26 disabilities.

27 48. As a result of the actions and failure of Defendants, and each of them, and as a
28 result of the failure to provide proper accessible public facilities, Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT**

1 was denied his civil rights, including his right to full and equal access to public facilities, was
 2 embarrassed and humiliated, suffered physical, psychological and mental injuries and
 3 emotional distress, mental distress, mental suffering, mental anguish, which includes shame,
 4 humiliation, embarrassment, anger, chagrin, disappointment and worry, expectedly and
 5 naturally associated with a person with a physical disability being denied access to a public
 6 accommodation.

7 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for damages as hereinafter stated.

8 **III. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S CIVIL RIGHTS ACTS
 10 (***California Civil Code*** §§ 54, 54.1 and 54.3)

11 49. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference as if fully set forth again herein,
 12 the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 48 of this Complaint and incorporates them
 13 herein as if separately repled.

14 50. The public facilities above-described constitute public facilities and public
 15 accommodations within the meaning of ***California Health & Safety Code*** § 19955 *et seq.* and
 16 were facilities to which members of the public are invited. The aforementioned acts and
 17 omissions of defendants, and each of them, constitute a denial of equal access to and use and
 18 enjoyment of these facilities by persons with disabilities, including Plaintiff **MARSHALL**
 19 **LOSKOT**. Said acts and omissions are also in violation of provisions of Title 24 of the
 20 ***California Code of Regulations***.

21 51. The rights of Plaintiff, the entitlement of Plaintiff to full and equal access and the
 22 denial by defendants of such rights and entitlements are set forth in ***California Civil Code*** §§
 23 54, 54.1 and 54.3, to wit:

24 Individuals with disabilities shall have the same right as the...general
 25 public to full and free use of the streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public
 26 buildings, public facilities, and other public places. ***California Civil Code*** §
 27 54(a).

28 Individuals with disabilities shall be entitled to full and equal access, as
 other members of the general public, to accommodations, advantages, facilities,
 and privileges of all common carriers, airplanes, motor vehicles, railroad trains,
 motor buses, streetcars, boats, or any other public conveyances or modes of
 transportation (whether private, public, franchised, licensed, contracted, or

otherwise provided), telephone facilities, adoption agencies, private schools, hotels, lodging places, places of public accommodation, amusement or resort, and other places to which the general public is invited, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, or state or federal regulation, and applicable alike to all persons. **California Civil Code** § 54.1(a).

52. On or about May 30, 2006, Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** suffered violations of **California Civil Code** §§ 54 and 54.1 in that he was denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities and privileges of said **DAYS' INN**, as set forth in paragraph 3 above.

Plaintiff was also denied full and equal access to other particulars, including, but not limited to, those described hereinabove. Plaintiff was also denied use of facilities that he was entitled to under Title III of the **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**.

53. As a result of the denial of full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities and privileges of defendants' **DAYS' INN** due to the acts and omissions of defendants, and each of them, in owning, operating and maintaining this subject public facility, Plaintiff suffered violations of his civil rights, including, but not limited to, rights under **California Civil Code** §§ 54, 54.1, and 54.3, and has and will suffer physical injury, emotional distress, mental distress, mental suffering, mental anguish, which includes shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anger, chagrin, disappointment and worry, expectedly and naturally associated with a disabled person's denial of full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, privileges, etc. all to his damages as prayed hereinafter in an amount within the jurisdiction of the court. Defendants' actions and omissions to act constituted discrimination against Plaintiff on the sole basis that Plaintiff was physically disabled.

54. Plaintiff seeks damages for the violation of his rights as a disabled person on or about May 30, 2006, according to proof, pursuant to **California Civil Code** § 54.3, including a trebling of all statutory and actual damages, general and special, available pursuant to **California Civil Code** § 54.3(a).

55. As a result of defendants' acts and omissions in this regard, Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** has been required to incur legal expenses and hire attorneys in order to enforce his rights and enforce provisions of the law protecting the full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, facilities, privileges of public facilities by the disabled, and those individuals

1 associated with or accompanied by a person with disabilities, and prohibiting discrimination
2 against the disabled. Plaintiff, therefore, seeks recovery in this lawsuit for all reasonable
3 attorneys' fees incurred pursuant to the provisions of **California Civil Code** § 55. Additionally,
4 Plaintiff's lawsuit is intended not only to obtain compensation for damages to Plaintiff, but also
5 to compel the defendants to make their goods, services, facilities and privileges available and
6 accessible to all members of the public with physical disabilities, justifying public interest
7 attorneys' fees pursuant to the provisions of **California Code of Civil Procedure** § 1021.5.

8 56. The acts and omissions of defendants in failing to provide the required
9 accessible facilities subsequent to the enactment date and compliance date of the **Americans**
10 **with Disabilities Act of 1990**, and refusal to make remedial modifications and alterations to its
11 handicapped parking, handicapped signage, pathways, and other elements as hereinabove
12 stated, after being notified by patrons before and after the time of Plaintiff's visit and injuries,
13 on or about May 30, 2006, and all times prior thereto with the knowledge that persons with
14 disabilities would enter defendants' premises, the reason given therefor, was an established
15 policy, practice and procedure of refusing and denying entry, thereby denying services to a
16 person with disabilities and the companions thereof, evidence malice and oppression toward
17 Plaintiff and other disabled persons.

18 57. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief pursuant to **California Civil Code** § 55 to require
19 Defendants to comply with federal and state access regulations.

20 58. Defendants have failed to establish a nondiscriminatory criteria, policy, practice
21 and procedure for entry into said "**DAYS' INN**" as hereinabove described.

22 59. As a result of defendants' continuing failure to provide for the full and equal
23 enjoyment of goods, services, facilities and privileges of said "**DAYS' INN**" as hereinabove
24 described, Plaintiff has continually been denied his rights to full and equal enjoyment of the
25 subject motel, as it would be a "futile gesture" to attempt to patronize said "**DAYS' INN**" with
26 the discriminatory policy in place as hereinabove described.

27 60. The acts and omissions of defendants as complained of herein in failing to
28 provide the required accessible facilities subsequent to the enactment date and compliance

1 date of the **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990** and refusal to make remedial
 2 modifications and alternations to the architectural barriers as stated herein and in failing to
 3 establish practices, policies and procedures to allow safe access by persons who are disabled
 4 are continuing on a day-to-day basis to have the effect of wrongfully and willfully excluding
 5 Plaintiff and other members of the public who are physically disabled, from full and equal
 6 enjoyment of the subject "**DAYS' INN**" as hereinabove described. Such acts and omissions
 7 are the continuing cause of humiliation and mental and emotional suffering of Plaintiff in that
 8 these actions continue to treat Plaintiff as an inferior and second class citizen and serve to
 9 discriminate against him on the sole basis that he is physically disabled. Plaintiff is unable, so
 10 long as such acts and omissions of defendants continue, to achieve full and equal enjoyment
 11 of the goods and services of said "**DAYS' INN**" as described hereinabove. The acts of
 12 defendants have legally caused and will continue to cause irreparable injury to Plaintiff if not
 13 enjoined by this court.

14 61. Wherefore, Plaintiff asks this court to preliminarily and permanently enjoin any
 15 continuing refusal by defendants to permit entry to said "**DAYS' INN**" and to serve Plaintiff or
 16 others similarly situated, and to require defendants to comply forthwith with the applicable
 17 statutory requirements relating to the full and equal enjoyment of goods and services as
 18 described hereinabove for disabled persons. Such injunctive relief is provided by **California**
 19 **Civil Code** § 55. Plaintiff further requests that the court award statutory costs and attorneys'
 20 fees to Plaintiff pursuant to **California Civil Code** § 55 and **California Code of Civil**
 21 **Procedure** § 1021.5, all as hereinafter prayed for.

22 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for compensatory damages, reasonable attorneys' fees
 23 and costs of suit, as allowed by statute and according to proof.

24 **IV. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
 25 VIOLATIONS OF **UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT**
 26 (**California Civil Code** §§ 51 and 51.5)

27 62. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein,
 28 the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 61 of this Complaint and incorporates them
 herein as if separately repled.

63. Defendants' acts and omissions as specified with regard to the discriminatory treatment of Plaintiff **MARSHALL LOSKOT** on the basis of his physical disabilities, have been in violation of **California Civil Code** §§ 51 and 51.5, the **Unruh Civil Rights Act**, and have denied to Plaintiff his rights to "full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever."

64. **California Civil Code** § 51 also provides that "[a] violation of the right of any individual under the **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990** (Public Law 101-336) shall also constitute a violation of this section."

65. **California Civil Code** § 51.5 also provides that

"[n]o business establishment of any kind whatsoever shall discriminate against, boycott, or blacklist, refuse to buy from, sell to, or trade with any person in this state because of the race, creed, religion, color, national origin, sex, disability of the person or of the person's partners, members, stockholders, directors, officers, managers, superintendents, agents, employees, business associates, suppliers, or customers."

66. As a result of the violation of Plaintiff's civil rights protected by **California Civil Code** §§ 51 and, 51.5, Plaintiff is entitled to the rights and remedies of **California Civil Code** § 52, including a trebling of actual damages (defined by **California Civil Code** § 52(h) to mean "special and general damages"), as well as reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as allowed by statute, according to proof.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief as follows:

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief as follows:

1. Grant injunctive relief requiring that defendants establish a non-discriminatory criteria policy, practice and procedure permitting entry into the **DAYS' INN** in San Bruno, San Mateo County, California, for the purpose of obtaining the goods and services accorded therein according to **California Civil Code** §§ 51, 51.5, 52, 54, 54.1, 54.3, and 55, *et seq.*, and Title III of the **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**, and grant injunctive relief requiring that Defendants repair and render safe to handicapped persons, and otherwise make

handicapped-accessible, all public areas of the motel, including, but not limited to, each of the barriers to access identified in Paragraph 3, above, and make such facilities “readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,” according to the standards of Title 24 of the **California Administrative Code, California Health & Safety Code** § 19955 *et seq.*, and Title III of the **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990** and the standards of **ADAAG**; and prohibiting operation of the **DAYS’ INN**, located in San Bruno, San Mateo County, California, as a public facility until Defendants provide full and equal enjoyment of goods and services as described hereinabove to physically disabled persons, including Plaintiff;

2. General damages according to proof;

3. Statutory and “actual” damages, including general damages and special damages, according to proof, pursuant to **California Civil Code** §§ 52, and 54.3, and that these damages be trebled;

4. Prejudgment interest on all compensatory damages;

5. Remedies and Procedures available under **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990** §§ 107, 203 and 308;

6. Award Plaintiff all litigation expenses, all costs of this proceeding and all reasonable attorneys’ fees as provided by law, including, but not limited to, those recoverable pursuant to the provisions of **California Civil Code** §§ 52, 54.3, and 55, **California Code of Civil Procedure** § 1021.5, and **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990** §308 of Title III; and

7. Grant such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

SINGLETON LAW GROUP

Dated: November 14, 2006

/s/ Jason K. Singleton

Jason K. Singleton, Attorney for

Plaintiff, **MARSHALL LOSKOT**

///

///

///

///

REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby requests a jury for all claims for which a jury is permitted.

SINGLETON LAW GROUP

Dated: November 14, 2006

/s/ Jason K. Singleton
Jason K. Singleton, Attorney for
Plaintiff, **MARSHALL LOSKOT**